



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/821,479

04/09/2004

Hector F. DeLuca

1256-00946

1063

26753

7590

05/10/2006

ANDRUS, SCEALES, STARKE & SAWALL, LLP
100 EAST WISCONSIN AVENUE, SUITE 1100
MILWAUKEE, WI 53202

EXAMINER

QAZI, SABIHA NAIM

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1616

DATE MAILED: 05/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Final Office Action

Acknowledgement is made of the response filed on 2/14/06. Claims 1-109 are pending. Claims 1-11, 13-19 and 22-29 are rejected. Claims 12, 20 and 21 are allowed. Others are withdrawn from consideration as non elected invention.

Response to Remarks

- Applicant's comments regarding claims 12, 20 and 21 were found persuasive. These claims are now allowed because these compounds are not taught nor suggested by the prior art. The substitution at 2-position represented by X (in present invention) by hydroxyalkyl or protected hydroxy group is not taught by the prior art.
- Arguments about rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable United States Patent No. 6,392,071 and 5,843,928 (DeLUCA et al.) and DP over '928 has been fully considered but was found persuasive in part. The advantages and comparison are disclosed on page 31 of the remarks. It is unclear what is high, low and moderate calcemic activity. Applicant may consider filing a declaration presenting unexpected results compared with the prior art as they have shown in the remarks.
- Claims 30-35 drawn to intermediates compounds should be cancelled while responding to this office action.
- The rejection is being maintained for the same reasons as set forth in our previous office action.

Eligible for Rejoinder of method claims

In order to be eligible for rejoinder, a claim to a nonelected invention must depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable claim. A withdrawn claim that does not require all the limitations of an allowable claim will not be rejoined.

Furthermore,

where restriction was required between a product and a process of making and/or using the product, and the product invention was elected and subsequently found allowable, all claims to a nonelected process invention must depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable claim for the claims directed to that process invention to be eligible for rejoinder. See MPEP § 821.04(b).

Until elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claim that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product will not be rejoined. See “Guidance on Treatment of Product and process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103 (b),” 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996).

In order to retain the right to rejoinder,

applicant is advised that the claims to the nonelected invention(s) should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the elected invention. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.

Rejoined claims must be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112.

See also MPEP § 804.01.

Information Disclosure Statement

The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

Copending Applications

Applicants must bring to the attention of the examiner, or other Office official involved with the examination of a particular application, information within their knowledge as to other copending United States applications, which are "material to patentability" of the application in question. MPEP 2001.06(b). See *Dayco Products Inc. v. Total Containment Inc.*, 66 USPQ2d 1801 (CA FC 2003).

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed.

Art Unit: 1616

Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-11, 13-19 and 22-29 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11 and 14-16 of U.S. Patent No. 5843928. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because presently claimed invention is considered obvious over the reference. See the entire document especially the abstract, summary of invention, and claims.

3. Presently claimed invention is generically claimed by the US '928. The invention is considered obvious when X represents H, alkyl or hydroxy protecting group and US '928 when R6 and R8 represent hydroxyalkyl group. Presently claimed invention is drawn to 2-hydroxypropylidene-19-nor compounds and their derivatives. Even though none of the exemplified compounds represent hydroxy propylidene compounds as presently claimed however, claims do recite generically presently claimed compounds.

Art Unit: 1616

4. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to prepare additional beneficial compounds at the time of invention because the reference teaches such compounds.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Art Unit: 1616

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-11, 13-19 and 22-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of United States Patent No. 6,392,071 and 5,843,928 (DeLUCA et al.). Both the reference teaches 2-methylene compounds, which embrace presently, claimed invention. See line last two lines in col. 2 and line 1 in col. 3 where R₆ and R₈ can be hydroxy alkyl (in US '071) and abstract, summary of invention in column 2, lines 5-65 in column 3, lines 22-67 in column 6, examples and claims (in '928).

Instant claims differ from the reference in that they are of different generic scope. Presently claimed invention is obvious when in prior art one of R₆ and R₈ represent H, hydroxy alkyl Y₁ and Y₂ are H, and 26 and 27 are dihydro, the reference teaches all the substituents as presently claimed. Instant claims are generically taught by the prior art and would have been suggested to one skilled in the art. See the entire document especially in '928 abstract, summary of invention in column 2, lines 5-65 in column 3, lines 22-67 in column 6, examples and claims.

Art Unit: 1616

It had been held by Courts that the indiscriminate selection of “some” from among “many” is considered prima facie obvious. In re Lemin, 141 USPQ 814 (1964); National Distillers and Chem. Corp. V. Brenner, 156 USPQ 163.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to prepare additional beneficial hydroxypropylidene vitamin D compounds as presently claimed with the expectation that it would be useful for the treatment of cancer, psoriasis and various other diseases because prior art teach hydroxyalkyl substituted on 2-methylene vitamin D (see substituent of R₆ and R₈). Prior does not teach any specific compound in the examples or in claims however, these compounds are generically taught and therefore considered obvious.

The instant claimed compounds would have been obvious because one skilled in the art would have been motivated to prepare compounds embraced by the genus of the above cited references with the expectation of obtaining additional beneficial compounds.

One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to select the claimed compounds from the genus in the reference since such compounds would have been suggested by the reference as a whole. It has been held that a prior art disclosed genus of useful compounds is sufficient to render prima facie obvious a species falling within the genus. In re Susi, 440 F.2d 442, 445, 169 USPQ 423, 425 (CCPA 1971), followed by the Federal Circuit in Merck & Co. V. Biocraft Laboratories, 874 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ 2d 1843, 1846 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Art Unit: 1616

In the light of the forgoing discussion, the Examiner's ultimate legal conclusion is that the subject matter defined by the instant claims would have been obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sabiha Qazi whose telephone number is 571-272-0622. The examiner can normally be reached on any business day.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Johann Richter can be reached on 571-272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1616

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


SABIHA QAZI, PH.D
PRIMARY EXAMINER